

To: Way, Steven[way.steven@epa.gov]
From: Williams, Laura
Sent: Mon 8/31/2015 12:08:42 PM
Subject: Re: Temporary and Interim Water Treatment Options

Not a problem. We've been working with Kerry. I think we have a good number so you can get what you need to before winter. TY - lw

Sent from my iPhone

> On Aug 30, 2015, at 11:04 PM, Way, Steven <way.steven@epa.gov> wrote:
>
> Laura,
>
> The current estimate for interim treatment is being developed:
>
> 1. operating costs are estimated at \$1.5 mill / year
> 2. construction costs for an interim system may be on the order of \$1mil. However, I can get you a better estimate after tomorrow.
>
> Steve
>
> Steven Way
> Federal On-Scene Coordinator
> Emergency Response Unit
> US EPA - Region 8
> 1595 Wynkoop Street
> Denver, CO 80202
>
> Office: 303-312-6723
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Williams, Laura
> Sent: Friday, August 28, 2015 9:53 AM
> To: Guy, Kerry
> Cc: Way, Steven; Poetter, Joe
> Subject: Re: Temporary and Interim Water Treatment Options
>
> Kerry and/or Steve:
>
> Do you have a ballpark estimate of the water treatment costs: both for the treatment development (modular units or ponds) and monthly, winter operating costs? I'd like to include these in the GKM estimate we provide to HQ today. Thank you, lw
>
>
> _____
> From: Guy, Kerry
> Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2015 6:29 PM
> To: Way, Steven
> Cc: Powell, Greg; Griswold, Hays; Williams, Laura; Brobst, Bob; Myers, Craig
> Subject: Re: Temporary and Interim Water Treatment Options
>
> Yes--I confirm that the evaluation team is unanimous in this decision. The modular units are too costly compared to what can be done at the site with earthen lined ponds-- greater than 3 times what we can expect to incur by building ponds at Gladstone. In addition, they require extensive support by us.
>
> _____

> From: Way, Steven
> Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2015 5:13 PM
> To: Guy, Kerry
> Cc: Powell, Greg; Griswold, Hays; Williams, Laura; Brobst, Bob; Myers, Craig
> Subject: Temporary and Interim Water Treatment Options
>
> Kerry,
>
> As follow up to our conference call, the technical review team provided an excellent assessment and recommendations to allow the operations to move forward. Based on the proposals and costs estimates, the "package" systems are unreasonably costly for the period of performance.
>
> The consensus among the technical team and site personnel is the best path forward is to prepare the upper level of the Gladstone area to perform lime addition with appropriate settling ponds.
>
> The START engineer with the OSCs have identified an area and configuration that can be used for this purpose. A figure was provided to you earlier today. We look forward to the additional recommendations for designing the retention cells and components for the lime addition.
>
> Currently, ERRS is working on a cost estimate to develop and operate this type of system. Also, there are local experienced personnel who have run the treatment operations when the mine was active.
>
> Please confirm our that this is our best path forward if water treatment is in fact needed on an interim basis (possibly 12 months).
>
> Thank you,
>
> Sent from my iPad